

Atty. Docket No. 020702
Serial No. 10/675,504
Response Dated October 17, 2006
Reply to Office Action dated August 4, 2006

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
OCT 17 2006

REMARKS

Claims 34-56 stand in this application. Claims 1-29 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter contained therein. Claims 46 and 54 have been amended. No matter has been added. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the standing claims is respectfully requested.

Drawings

On page 2, paragraph 1 of the Office Action, the drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83 (a). Applicant has amended Claim 54 to recite features shown in the drawings. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to the drawings.

Claim Objections

On page 2, paragraph 2 of the Office Action, Claim 2 is objected to for an informality. Applicant has cancelled Claim 2 without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter contained therein. Therefore, the objection is now rendered moot.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

On page 3, paragraph 4 of the Office Action, Claims 1, 5, 14, 16-22, 24-26, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Jacob et al. (US 6,871,983). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Applicant has cancelled Claims 1, 5, 14, 16-22, 24-26. Therefore, the anticipation rejection is now rendered moot.

Atty. Docket No. 020702
Serial No. 10/675,504
Response Dated October 17, 2006
Reply to Office Action dated August 4, 2006

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 17 2006

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

On page 6, paragraph 7 of the Office Action, Claims 1, 6-7, 15, 20-21, 23-25 and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan et al. (US 6,692,251) in view of Bianchetti et al. (US 6,857,873). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Applicant has cancelled Claims 1, 6-7, 15, 20-21, 23-25 and 27-29 without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter contained therein. Therefore, the obviousness rejection is now rendered moot.

On page 6, paragraph 10 of the Office Action, Claims 2-4 and 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan et al. (US 6,692,251) and Bianchetti et al. (US 6,857,873), as applied to Claims 1 and 7 above, and further in view of Teshima et al. (US 4,271,408). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Applicant has cancelled Claims 2-4 and 8-9 without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter contained therein. Therefore, the obviousness rejection is now rendered moot.

On page 7, paragraph 12 of the Office Action, Claims 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan et al. (US 6,692,251) and Bianchetti et al. (US 6,857,873), as applied to Claims 1 and 7 above, and further in view of Cao (US 6,331,111). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Applicant has cancelled Claims 10-13 without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter contained therein. Therefore, the obviousness rejection is now rendered moot.


Allowable Subject Matter

On page 8, paragraph 14 of the Office Action, Claims 34-56 are allowed.
Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests a timely Notice of Allowance for all currently pending

Atty. Docket No. 020702
Serial No. 10/675,504
Response Dated October 17, 2006
Reply to Office Action dated August 4, 2006

claims of the captioned application. Any questions associated with the present amendment are invited to the attention of applicant's undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,



Roberto Capriotti
Reg. No. 46,599

Attorney for Applicant

KIRKPATRICK & LOCKHART NICHOLSON GRAHAM LLP
Henry W. Oliver Building
535 Smithfield Street
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15222-2312
Telephone: (412) 355-6423
Fax: (412) 355-6501
E-mail: rcapriotti@klng.com

Customer No. 26285